

## PATENT

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 2, 2006 has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

**Claims 1, 2 and 5-9, 11-13, and 19-21 are allowable**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11-13, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0039242) in view of Ishidoshiro (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/006676). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claims 2, 5-7, and 19-20 depend, recites the element of "sending a call forwarding message including the internet protocol address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network." As admitted in the Office Action at page 3, this element is not disclosed or suggested by Moore. This element is also not disclosed or suggested by Ishidoshiro. Ishidoshiro discloses a system including a wireless LAN base station and a radio internet protocol (IP) telephone. *Ishidoshiro*, [0038]. To authenticate the radio IP telephone, the wireless LAN base station sends an IP address to the radio IP telephone. *Id.* The radio IP telephone "then notifies the wireless LAN base station of a terminal ID." *Id.* (emphasis added). The terminal ID may contain an IP address. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Ishidoshiro that the radio IP telephone sends a call forwarding message to any network element. Furthermore, the IP address sent by the radio IP telephone of Ishidoshiro is sent to the wireless LAN base station, not to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Moore and Ishidoshiro, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Claims 2, 5-7, and 19-20 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Moore and Ishidoshiro, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

With respect to claim 8, from which claims 9, 11-13 and 21 depend, the claim recites "retrieving an internet protocol address and an optional port number associated with the wireless

local area network base station from a memory” and “sending the internet protocol address and optional port number over a wireless fidelity communication link to the mobile phone.” As admitted in the Office Action at page 5, these elements are not disclosed or suggested by Moore. In addition, these elements are also not disclosed or suggested by Ishidoshiro. Ishidoshiro does not disclose or suggest receiving an optional port number, nor does Ishidoshiro disclose or suggest sending the optional port number to a mobile phone. Ishidoshiro discloses sending an IP address from a wireless LAN base station to a radio IP phone but does not disclose or suggest sending an optional port number to the phone. Accordingly, Moore and Ishidoshiro, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 8.

Claims 9, 11-13 and 21 depend from claim 8. Accordingly, Moore and Ishidoshiro, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 8.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-9, 11-13, and 19-21 is improper. Reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 3 and 10 are allowable**

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Ishidoshiro in further view of Reding (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0213212). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As explained above, Moore and Ishidoshiro do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Moreover, Reding does not remedy the deficiency of Moore and Ishidoshiro. Reding discloses a method for forwarding a call if a first device, such a phone, enters the vicinity of a second device, such as a computer. *Reding*, Abstract. Reding does not disclose or suggest sending a call forwarding message including an internet protocol address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network, as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Moore, Ishidoshiro, and Reding, individually and in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of claim 1. Further, the references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 3, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8. As explained above, Moore and Ishidoshiro do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 8. Moreover, Reding does not remedy the deficiency of Moore and Ishidoshiro. Reding does not disclose or suggest retrieving an internet protocol address and an optional port number associated with the wireless local area network base station from a memory and sending the internet protocol address and optional port number over a wireless fidelity communication link to the mobile phone, as recited by claim 8. Accordingly, Moore, Ishidoshiro, and Reding, individually and in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of claim 8. Further, the references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 10, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 8.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 3 and 10 is improper. Reconsideration of claim 4 and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

**Claim 4 is allowable**

At page 9 of the Office Action, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Ishidoshiro in further view of Shostak (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0127241).

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As explained above, Moore and Ishidoshiro do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Moreover, Shostak does not remedy the deficiency of Moore and Ishidoshiro. Shostak discloses a system employing personal badges to allow a user to initiate and receive calls over a network. *Shostak*, Abstract. Shostak does not disclose or suggest sending a call forwarding message including an internet protocol address from the mobile phone to a remote cellular network element of a wide area cellular network, as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Moore, Ishidoshiro, and Shostak, individually and in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of claim 1. Further, the references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 4, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 4 is improper. Reconsideration of claim 4 and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

**Claims 14, 15, and 18 are allowable**

At page 10 of the Office Action, claims 14, 15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding in view of Moore and Ishidoshiro. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14, from which claims 15 and 18 depend, recites "a short-range wireless local area network module disposed within the housing, the short-range wireless local area network module having a wireless interface to communicate with the wireless local area network having voice over internet protocol communications capability, wherein the wide area cellular communication module formulates a call forwarding message that includes the internet protocol address, the call forwarding message to be communicated to the remote wide area cellular network." As admitted in the Office Action at page 10, this element is not disclosed or suggested by Reding or Moore. Further, as explained above with respect to claim 1, the system of Ishidoshiro does not send a call forwarding message. Further, the system of Ishidoshiro sends an IP address to a wireless LAN base station, not to a remote wide area cellular network. Accordingly, Ishidoshiro does not disclose or suggest a wide area cellular communication module that formulates a call forwarding message that includes an internet protocol address, the call forwarding message to be communicated to the remote wide area cellular network, as recited by claim 14. Thus, Reding, Moore, and Ishidoshiro, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 14.

Claims 15 and 18 depend from claim 14. Accordingly, Reding, Moore, and Ishidoshiro, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 14.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 14, 15, and 18 is improper. Reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite

resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

2-14-2006  
Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler; Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicants  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.  
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)